

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

ORDER

Plaintiff is correct in his assertion that leave is not required to file his First Amended Complaint. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a); Williams v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 477 F.3d 1282, 1291 (11th Cir. 2007). The portion of the court's June 6, 2007 order directing the plaintiff to file a motion for leave is VACATED, and the Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint (Doc. # 14) is DENIED as MOOT. The defendants shall answer or otherwise respond to the First Amended Complaint **on or before June 25, 2007**, and shall respond to the plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. # 16) in accordance with the April 30, 2007 briefing order.

SO ORDERED.

DONE this 21st day of June, 2007.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE